

ANG

PAHAYAGAN NG PARTIDO KOMUNISTA NG PILIPINAS
PINAPATNUBAYAN NG
MARXISMO-LENINISMO-KAISIPANG MAO TSETUNG



Special Issue

(English Edition)

November 30, 1971

POMEROY'S APOLOGIA FOR SOVIET REVISIONISM

by Amado Guerrero

Introduction

Half a Century of Socialism (Soviet Life in the Sixties) unfolds the role of William J. Pomeroy as both an agent of Soviet modern revisionism and U.S. imperialism. This book pretends to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution but in fact it celebrates the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the all-round restoration of capitalism in the homeland of the great Lenin. It heaps all kinds of empty praise for the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union and for the 23rd Congress and the plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee from 1965 to 1967 by which Brezhnev and his revisionist gang ~~sought to oust~~ ^{kept out} Khrushchov in bringing about the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Speaking from a bourgeois reactionary and idealist viewpoint, Pomeroy disparages dialectical materialism, the law of contradiction and class analysis as "oversimplification". In no uncertain terms, he rails: "A revolutionary who is prone to see everything in two-toned contrasts is disconcerted in meeting a capitalist who might be a decent person or a fellow revolutionary who might be unscrupulous." What a counter-revolutionary way of summing up reality! His sinister purpose sticks out: it is to attack the revolutionary proletariat and praise the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie to the heavens.

Himself involved in the class struggle on the side of the bourgeoisie, he dishes up his own "two-toned contrasts" in a revisionist manner well-echoed from his Soviet revisionist masters. He raves: "The hammer and sickle were an apt symbol in the time of Lenin." And he hastens to counterpose: "Today's symbols are the computer, the transistor and the atomic ring." He slanders Lenin and Stalin as the paragons of "backwardness" and vents his spite on the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pays high tribute to his current revisionist renegade masters Brezhnev and Kosygin as the paragons of "technical progress" and describes in the most glowing terms the fascist dictatorship of the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie.

Pomeroy prates that the difference between what he calls the past (the time of Lenin and Stalin) and the present (the time of his Soviet revisionist masters) lies in the "advance of techniques". This is to cover up the betrayal of Leninism and the peaceful evolution of the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship through the machinations of such usurpers as Khrushchov and Brezhnev who is Khrushchov the Second. In the process, he also manages to throw in a flimsily-

disguised praise for the international big bourgeoisie. He states:

People in the developed countries are fully aware of the differences in their present lives and outlooks from those of their forebears at the turn of the century or in the 1920's. They look back with superior smiles at what are considered to be rather primitive times. If this can be true under capitalism, which tends to resist change, it is much more true under socialism which has transformed the condition of living in a much more rapid and thoroughgoing manner.

The trick in Pomeroy's sophistry is simple. He puts technique ahead of politics, and socialism at par with capitalism on the basis of techniques. People in the capitalist countries are made out to appear as enjoying the bounties of technical progress in the same manner that people in the Soviet Union are supposed to be enjoying the same things now. The end of this line of misrepresentation is "to look back with superior smiles" at the "primitive times" of Lenin and Stalin. But can the Soviet revisionist renegades really do this? It is most interesting to look at how rotten Soviet society has become after the betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Pomeroy opposes to its very core the October Revolution and impugns its historical necessity in the advance of the world proletarian revolution. He goes as far as to state that "it would be wrong to say that socialist revolutions elsewhere would have been impossible without the prior existence of the Soviet Union". The October Revolution of 1917 is a historical fact and no genuine revolutionary ever doubts its necessary value to all succeeding socialist revolutions. It verified and brought to reality the theory of proletarian dictatorship and became the cornerstone of the world proletarian revolution. Its salvoes brought Marxism-Leninism to the people of the world. Therefore, it is idle historical idealism for Pomeroy to prate that socialist revolution would be possible even without the October Revolution.

On the Proletarian Dictatorship

Marx wrote:

Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under the guidance of Marxism and on the basis of the great practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, Lenin clearly pointed out: "The transition from capitalism to communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration; and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration. In this regard, therefore, he repeatedly stressed: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is essential."

Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and abroad, Chairman Mao has stated even more explicitly:

Socialist society covers a considerably long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. Our instruments of dictatorship must be strengthened, not weakened.

Learning from the historical experience of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries, Chairman Mao has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. *These recent theoretical and practical contributions of Chairman Mao have brought the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism to a completely new and higher stage. All these are in keeping with the Marxist-Leninist view that in a socialist society, lasting for an entire historical epoch, classes, class contradictions and class struggle persist.*

What does Pomeroy say in opposition to the kernel of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, which is the dictatorship of the proletariat? He says:

. . . opposing classes have ceased to exist in the Soviet Union and that what prevails is a "state of the whole people". In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counter-revolutionary tendencies within the country, but as an instrument directed solely against enemies from outside.

This is unadulterated Khrushchovism and Brezhnevism.

Long before the blatant counter-revolutionary coup d'etat launched by Khrushchov, the capitalist-readers in the Soviet Union had insisted that there were no more classes, class contradictions and class struggle. It has turned out that to stop or obscure the waging of revolutionary class struggle is to allow the bourgeoisie to take over the state and restore capitalism through peaceful evolution. Not to put proletarian politics in command of everything consciously and vigorously is to allow bourgeois politics to take over in a socialist society. There are ^{vestigial} latent and hidden agents of the big bourgeoisie who are ready to spring into counter-revolutionary action under the cover of techniquism and economism whenever the proletarian dictatorship lets down its vigilance and its determination to continue the revolution.

After the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution, the anti-Marxists and anti-Leninists openly flaunt the theory of "state of the whole people" in order to denote the dissolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its replacement by the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie represented by Khrushchov and then by Brezhnev. It is no surprise, therefore, that the anti-communist scoundrel Pomeroy now admits that his Soviet revisionist masters no longer think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument for suppressing counter-revolutionary tendencies within the country. State power for them is itself the instrument for counter-revolution.

Throughout Pomeroy's book, it is clear that the kind of "people" who are now living it up in capitalist style in the Soviet Union belong to the privileged bourgeois stratum. They rob the state treasury centrally and in various enterprises and farms, live in a kind of luxury imitative of the bourgeoisie in the West, squander the social wealth accumulated for decades through the hard work of the Soviet laboring people and intensify oppression and exploitation in order to raise their profits. At the top of this privileged bourgeois stratum is the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie which lord over the state and Party, operate the means of production ~~in~~ capitalist enterprises and poison education and culture to suit their capitalist ends. They ride roughshod over the Soviet proletariat, the people of various nationalities and the people of other countries, especially a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic.

Pomeroy refers to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an instrument "solely against enemies from outside". It is noteworthy that he does not make a single attack, not even a sham one, against U.S. imperialism in his concluding chapter which is his most concentrated way of presenting the revisionist view of the transition from socialism to communism. On the other hand, there is no let-up in his vicious but futile diatribes against the Lenin of the present era, Chairman Mao, and what he stands for--the world proletarian revolution in the present era, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the Chinese proletariat and people and the Chinese Communist Party. So it is clear that the arms expansion and war preparations being conducted by the Soviet revisionist rulers are meant to be used against China, communism, the people and revolution.

The revisionist Pomeroy regards the question of political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a mere short spell and as a mere preliminary to and as something discontinuous with economic construction. So, he chatters:

. . . if a Communist cadre is asked about the romanticism of what he is doing, he will most likely reply that the exciting struggle for power was only the initial struggle, the beginning of problems after which the hard weary work begins.

We say that the struggle for power does not cease after the seizure of power. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie continues in the entire historical epoch of socialism. It is imperative for the proletariat to continue the revolution, take command of everything and consolidate political power.

Pomeroy babbles further: "... after decades of a highly centralized dictatorship of the proletariat that was necessary to push through and to protect socialist construction, there is now the problem of broadening democratic participation in all phases of life." In this regard, he actually tries to isolate dictatorship and democracy from each other. He denies the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat, while suppressing the people's enemies, created during the time of Lenin and Stalin the broadest democracy among the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals. He further exposes his antagonism to genuine democracy when he tries to isolate the revolutionary mass movement and economic work from each other by prating that "... an efficiently-run socialist enterprise may possess much greater revolutionary potential than the largest of demonstrations." Only a counter-revolutionary will lay aside proletarian politics or subordinate it to economic work. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Political work is the lifeblood of all economic work."

The 20th Congress of the CPSU is ecstatically hailed by Pomeroy as the starting point of "democracy" in the Soviet Union. This was the black congress which blessed the counter-revolutionary coup of the modern revisionists against the dictatorship of the proletariat and which tried to spread throughout the world the poisonous revisionist ideas of "parliamentary road", "peaceful transition" and class collaboration with U.S. imperialism. Khrushchov achieved his revisionist purposes under the cover of "combatting the personality cult of Stalin".

In keeping with the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist stand of that Congress, Pomeroy takes any act or attitude having the character of "combatting the personality cult of Stalin" as "democratic". The entire historical epoch preceding the counter-revolution of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is negated by him through the simple trick of heaping all blame on Comrade Stalin, the leading representative of the proletariat after Lenin and before the revisionist rascals. Like his Soviet revisionist masters, he does not have the least respect for the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes, masses, parties and leaders. In effect, even Lenin is subject to revisionist curses for being the great and venerated leader of the Soviet and world proletariat.

What Pomeroy considers "democracy" is the bourgeois coup d'etat executed by his Soviet revisionist masters, the widespread purges carried out in all the Party and government organizations, from the higher down to the lower echelons, and the replacement of proletarian cadres in leading positions by the bourgeois intelligentsia and the worst dregs of Soviet society. Nearly 70 per cent of the CPSU Central Committee members elected at the 19th Congress in 1952 were purged by the time of the 22nd Congress in 1961. Among those elected at the 20th Congress in 1956, nearly 60 per cent was further removed by the time of the 23rd Congress in 1966. These big purges at the top reflected bigger purges below. These meant the aggravating rule of the privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union. The 22nd Congress systematized the Khrushchov revisionist programme of "three peacefuls" ("peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition") and "two wholes" ("Party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people"). The 23rd Congress sanctified the "new system" or "economic reform" which was first approved in the September, 1965 plenum of the Brezhnev-led CPSU Central Committee and which further pushed the full-scale restoration of capitalism.

Pomeroy considers it "impressive" that all kinds of ogres have crept out of their holes in the Soviet Union. He is extremely elated that in Soviet elections the revisionist-dominated Communist Party has lost prestige and out-and-out counter-revolutionaries are being voted into office; that bourgeois managers are in control over the means of production and are skimming the cream of the social wealth with their high salaries, big bonuses and other special privileges; and that a bourgeois intelligentsia is imitating what is most decadent in Western bourgeois culture under the guise of "internationalism." He hails

the entire rigmarole as "liberal atmosphere" and as the "broadening of democracy".

In pursuit of what Pomeroy calls "socialist legality", the Soviet revisionist renegades have sent genuine Communists in great numbers to mental hospitals and concentration camps since the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship by Khrushchov. Outright assassinations have occurred. Tanks and armored cars have been dispatched to suppress the resistance of the revolutionary masses of various nationalities against the oppressive revisionist rule. The Soviet army has been indoctrinated with revisionist ideology and revolutionary elements have been purged. Fascist laws and decrees such as the "regulations on the work of people's control", "amendments to the basic principles of the criminal code", "law on the basic principles of the corrective-labour legislation" and "regulations on preliminary detention" have proliferated. The police and spies have greatly increased in numbers and have run berserk. The army, the police, the prisons and courts are relentlessly used to enforce the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet people. Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, social-fascism, social-militarism and Great-Russian chauvinism have steadily increased the sufferings of the Soviet people.

Pomeroy actually equates "democracy" with bureaucratism and pictures it as a "guided process" "through channels" designed by the revisionist renegade clique. The revolutionary mass movement is anathema to him. Thus, he states:

The overcoming of Stalinism and the expansion of democracy have been astonishing. The implication of the present economic reform, with its predicted effects on bureaucratic tendencies, is that it will lead to extensive changes. Such processes have not been reflected in mass struggles among the Soviet people.

Pomeroy admits that the anti-Stalin campaign of vilification and the "economic reform" have never been reflected in mass struggles but merely imposed on the masses.

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, Soviet social-imperialism has fully emerged to invade the territory of other countries and abuse other peoples. It has exacerbated its new tsarist and colonial rule over a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic. It has invaded Czechoslovakia and abused the people there. It cannot tolerate the slightest difference of opinion with the leadership of other revisionist countries and is ~~went to~~ using the Warsaw Pact to threaten or blackmail other countries. It has also resorted to various means to sabotage and subvert the People's Republic of Albania. It has repeatedly made aggressive incursions on Chinese territory and has tried to outdo the old tsars. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, it has always tried to collude with or outbid U.S. imperialism in exploiting and oppressing the people.

On the All-Round Restoration of Capitalism

The great Lenin said: "Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting the ABC of Marxism." And Chairman Mao reiterates this Marxist-Leninist view: "Ideology and politics are the commander, the soul in everything. Economic and technical work are bound to go wrong if we in the least slacken our ideological and political work." In a socialist society, therefore, all proletarian revolutionaries are duty-bound to follow his teaching: "Grasp revolution, promote production."

It is utterly wrong to make production take the place of revolution or put the former in command of the latter. Thus, it is a desecration for Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters to "celebrate" the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the following spirit:

There are red banners and mass demonstrations on occasion, but mainly for the holiday; they are not for making demands but for celebrating progress measured in the organizational report, the statistical table, the computer . . . Today's revolution goes on in the workshop and laboratory.

This is bourgeois philistinism, pure and simple!

It is in this spirit that Pomeroy claims the Soviet Union to be the "most advanced socialist country" and to be "on a level higher, more complex and further developed than those reached by its brothers of the new society." What he considers as the "greatest significance" of the 50th year of the Soviet Union is that "a new communist society of abundance for all is on the immediate program of the present generation" and that "industry is now gearing itself to pour out the abundance that can satisfy the increasingly sophisticated wants and desires of the people." All because of "new techniques", he boasts that there is already "superabundance" in the Soviet Union. He prates:

What typically troubles people in the Soviet Union now is not where to find the next pound of potatoes but where to find the newest model television, while the line for trousers is in the process of being replaced by the waiting list for an automobile.

But is this the truth?

Within his own book, Pomeroy fails to be consistent with his lies and slaps his own face repeatedly. He reports that in his land of "superabundance" he saw several street beggars and these are not supposed to shake his faith in the socialist label tacked by his Soviet revisionist masters on their system. While he argues for the private ownership of cars as material incentive, he reports that the public transport system is gravely inadequate and inefficient throughout the Soviet Union. While he argues for private ownership of flats and villas as material incentive, he reports that there are long waiting lists for accommodation in public tenements, that residents in overcrowded tenements are grouchy, that there are those who collect high rent privately and that black-marketing of construction materials is spawned by private construction. While he argues for the expansion of private plots and personal subsidiary husbandry, he cites specific data proving that these have been attended to at the expense of the collective farms. While he boasts that there has been no shortage in basic commodities as potatoes and trousers, he reports that Khrushchov was cast away by his successors on account of agricultural shortages that included potato and cotton. He also testifies that there are long queues and bitter wranglings over scarce goods at department stores and such show-window cities as Moscow and Leningrad.

There is certainly no superabundance for the Soviet people. Those who enjoy the "superabundance" touted by Pomeroy belong to the privileged bourgeois stratum. They are the "managers", "experts" and "professionals" who plunder the social wealth of the Soviet Union. They have high incomes that are ten, a hundred or even a thousand times more than the income of the average worker. As Pomeroy himself confesses, they are the ones who can afford to buy the automobiles manufactured by Fiat and Renault and also to buy their own flats so that they can be saved from the "inconveniences" suffered by the masses.

Under the present circumstances in the Soviet Union, it is simply preposterous for Pomeroy and his revisionist masters to peddle the hope that within ten years (1967-77) passenger transport will be free and rent will no longer be collected. Big promises are made by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique obviously in order to blame failure later on their signboard of socialism and further justify the brazen restoration of capitalism. Khrushchov in his own time made big promises about "building the material and technical foundation of communism". When he failed to fulfill these promises, his successors went on to accelerate the restoration of capitalism in the style of drinking poison to quench thirst.

Let us sample the rotten bourgeois arguments of Pomeroy. Regarding the private ownership of cars: "Anyone who has been embedded in the rush-hour Moscow metro crowds can appreciate the urge to buy a car on the part of a commuting resident in a remote district." Regarding the private ownership of flats:

One of the advantages in owning a flat is that it can be remodeled or partitioned to the owner's liking, whereas in government housing permission for this must be obtained from the authorities. The greatest impulse in buying a lot, however, is that new living space can be obtained

faster in this way; normally people wait for a long period on a list for new public housing.

Is it not clear that the Soviet privileged bourgeois stratum lives it up at the expense of the Soviet people?

The "increasingly sophisticated wants and desires" of the privileged bourgeois stratum, as Pomeroy himself picturesquely describes them, include the adoption of the mini-skirt, the imitation of American jazz in the youth cafes, and the approximation of the latest styles and colors in London and New York by the House of Modes in Moscow. Of course, these are mere indicators of the gross luxury and decadence that characterize the high living enjoyed by the privileged bourgeois stratum. Pomeroy calls these "progress".

In an attempt to distort the Marxist-Leninist criticism that the Soviet privileged bourgeois stratum exploits the Soviet working people, Pomeroy claims that it is the "increase in living standards and in material well-being" that is being "denigrated" as capitalism by Marxist-Leninists. Childishly, he tries to counter Chairman Mao's criticism of the restoration of capitalism by referring to the fact that he ate sumptuous food at the residence of a friend of his who obviously belongs to the privileged bourgeois stratum. The profits of capitalism are, indeed, enjoyed by this privileged bourgeois stratum. The Soviet masses, on the other hand, suffer increasing impoverishment, unemployment, rising prices, shortages of supplies, shoddy goods and the like.

What the Soviet modern revisionists mean by "merging personal interest and public interest" is all too clear. It is the imposition of the personal interests of a few, the privileged bourgeois stratum, on the interests of the people.

Pomeroy actually makes a brazen attack on Marxism-Leninism, particularly dialectical materialism, when he pontificates: "The contrasting of personal and social interests, attempts to treat the personal interest as something incompatible with the ideals of the revolution, all this is opposed to the principles of socialism." There is a contradiction between personal interest and public interest. To deny this contradiction is to push modern revisionism forward.

Thus, it is important to always remember that as we serve the people, we must fight self and repudiate revisionism. True Communists are unselfish and their concern is always to serve the people. They will always see to it that the people are first assured of their basic necessities and the general level of livelihood is constantly raised, with no wide gaps between the cadre and the average worker. Centralized planning by the proletariat is used in a socialist society essentially to see to it that the general level of well-being among the people is raised as production is raised. In the People's Republic of China today, the people's livelihood is far better than in the Soviet Union despite the latter's claims of "technical superiority".

Let us go into the concrete meaning of a certain statement made by Brezhnev at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU: "The slow development of agriculture was due to a violation of the economic laws of production, neglect of the material incentives and of the correct combination of public and personal interests." Khrushchov was being blamed for not expanding the private plots fast enough and for not developing the private economy in agriculture fast enough. Regarding this, Pomeroy states:

During the premiership of Khrushchov (who has been criticized for disregard of the economic sciences) there were severe restrictions on cultivation of private plots by those belonging to collective farms. The restrictions were eliminated after the ouster of Khrushchov.

Pomeroy also faults the collectivization carried out by the great founders of the first socialist state. He rails:

'Backwardness' in agriculture is not wholly due to the wilfull neglect of economic laws. The great difficulty in the collectivization that began almost four decades ago was that the mechanization essential to the process was not sufficiently available, while the peasantry, still rooted in the

proletarian

age-old backwardness of small-holding cultivation, was not technologically prepared for the new system.

The modern revisionists put mechanization and technique ahead of politics and cooperation and collectivization. This is the theory of "productive forces"--the theory of allowing capitalism to grow while waiting for machines. And yet even as they boast of a high technological level now, they rapidly revert to a kulak economy in agriculture. They attack the establishment of Chinese communes in the same spirit that they have wrecked socialist agriculture in the Soviet Union. But without consistently raising the levels of agricultural cooperation, there would be no basis for rapid industrialization in China.

Soviet modern revisionism has brought down the living standards and reduced material well-being of the Soviet people. Disastrous economic results followed Khrushchov's treacherous act of raising to a state policy the imitation of the techniques of capitalist management in the United States. But, instead of discarding that rotten policy, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has blamed Khrushchov only for not outdoing himself in elaborating on and implementing the capitalist techniques of management. The revisionist programme of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU is a common ground for the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades. Its essence is the restoration of capitalism. That is what the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique calls "following the scientific laws of economics". And in this regard, Pomeroy arrogantly repeats a reactionary statement from Pravda: "But the fact that a law may lead to consequences undesirable to us does not stop its being a law and a law cannot be declared ineffective, just because people ignore it." This is a metaphysical statement which runs counter to the Marxist-Leninist law that the people are the motive force of history. What impudence!

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique gets the most lavish praise from Pomeroy for making a "profound adjustment" in the Soviet economic system since 1965. This is the "new economic system", otherwise called "economic reform", which establishes in a legal form the capitalist principle of profit for the benefit of the oligarchy of the big monopoly bureaucrats and the privileged bourgeois stratum, all at the expense of the Soviet working people. Its new feature is supposed to be the provision of material incentives, such as bonuses and other pay increases, for profitable management in an enterprise. It dictates the practice of capitalist management in all fields of the Soviet economy and it sanctifies the bonus as a "moral stimulus". It involves the complete disruption of the socialist relations of production and the thorough breaking up of the socialist economic base. The socialist economic system of unified economic planning by the state is abolished in favor of the anarchy of enterprises and farms are made to operate on the basis of profit-seeking.

In this regard, Pomeroy gloats: "Planning and distribution in the previous condition of scarcity is not the same as planning and distribution in a growing condition of abundance." He chatters:

It is at the level of the industrial enterprise that material incentives are being given their greatest emphasis. Hard economic facts have shown that centralized planning and the quota system of production at this stage of development do not enable the fullest efficient use of plant and equipment. These aims, it is felt, can be more completely achieved by linking the personal interest of the worker with what he is producing, i.e. by tying added income to efficient and good work.

This statement is in line with Kosygin's statement in 1965:

The present-day scientific and technical revolution advances to the fore such problems as technical standards, quality, reliability of goods and their effective use. It is precisely these factors that are today the focus of peaceful economic competition between socialist and capitalist countries.

Pomeroy gives the following as "the two main steps that comprise the heart of economic reform": "giving of a much greater degree of responsibility to the individual enterprise for planning, for production, for the introduction of new

technology, for the accumulation and use of profits, and for arranging the sale of its products"; and "greater emphasis on material incentives for workers in order to increase their efficiency and their output."

"Much greater degrees of responsibility to the individual enterprises" actually means further disintegrating and fragmenting the Soviet economy and reinforcing the overlord position of bourgeois managers and directors in individual enterprises. "Greater emphasis on material incentives for workers" actually means allowing the bourgeois managers and directors to treat the workers as wage slaves and get for themselves the profits of the enterprises through high salaries, bonuses and special privileges. Pomeroy himself observes:

. . . the expansion of the enterprises' rights and the strengthening of economic stimulation can give rise to parochial tendencies, to setting the interests of the enterprise against the interests of society, and even to money-grubbing . . .

Pomeroy also quotes Soviet "expert" Oleg Yun, who states:

The new system of industrial management and planning substantially extends the right of factory managers . . . in the sphere of planning, capital construction and repairs, introduction of more advanced technology and up-to-date techniques, material and technical supplies, marketing of finished goods, finance, labor and wages, etc.

The "new economic system" gives the enterprise the authority to "own, use and dispose of" all property in the enterprises, to sell "surplus" equipment, means of transport, raw materials, materials and fuel, to let premises, warehouses, equipment and means of transport which are "temporarily not in use", to write off on their own initiative "obsolete" assets, to use "funds at their disposal" for capital construction that is "outside the plan". There is a wide ground for the nefarious manipulation of assets. Managers even sell for profit such means of production as machine-tools, hoists, generators, locomotives and seamless tubes which are supposed to be state property. Soviet enterprises make profits on each other. Means of production and raw materials are also finding their way into private enterprises.

The managers are given the power to fix or change the wages, grades and bonuses for the workers and staff, to recruit or lay off workers and mete punishment to them, and to decide at will the structure and personnel of the enterprises. The ensuing result is the emergence of a grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union. Unemployment has developed on a large scale for two reasons: an enterprise goes bankrupt and is dissolved or workers are laid off or classified as apprentices to allow the managers and directors to claim profits for themselves. In short, the enterprises of socialist ownership have been turned into capitalist undertakings by the privileged bourgeois stratum, and broad sections of working people in industry and agriculture have been turned into wage slaves who have to sell their labor power. In the face of the grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union, Pomeroy can only shamelessly make the false claim that there is even labor shortage there.

Class polarization has been aggravated as a result of the "economic reform". The leaders of industrial enterprises, "state farms" and commercial establishments draw high pay which is scandalously more than that of the average worker, receive high bonuses, enjoy special privileges, indulge in unlawful practices such as manipulation of accounts, speculation, blackmarketing and underground enterprises, grossly abuse their power, and exploit and oppress the working people.

The enterprises are willing to produce only what they individually deem to be profitable, thus causing economic dislocation and gross disproportion in the overall development of the economy and shortages in basic commodities, raw materials and spare parts. Enterprises engaged in the same line of production compete with each other. To exact high profits, they keep on raising prices. They also raise profits covertly by using inferior materials, thus turning out goods of very poor quality.

"Economic reform" in the countryside has brought about a private economy-- a kulak economy. At the expense of collective and state farms, socialist restrictions on private plots and private livestock have been relaxed. Pomeroy himself unwittingly provides us some data for 1966 which show the anti-socialist course in agriculture. "Personal subsidiary husbandry" involved only "three per cent" of the country's cultivated land yet it accounted for about "17 per cent" of the total agricultural production. Within this total figure are: 60 per cent of the national potato crop, 40 per cent of the national crop of green vegetables, 40 per cent of the national production of dressed meat, 39 per cent of the national milk production and 68 per cent of the national egg production. With his twisted anti-socialist logic, Pomeroy argues that the private plots and private livestock should be enlarged because they have produced so much. This is supposed to be in compliance with the "scientific laws of economics". He completely disregards the fact that the collective and state farms have been neglected in favor of agricultural profiteers. Consistent with the capitalist rationale behind the enlargement of private plots, the state and collective farms have been turned over to "field teams" which act autonomously for the benefit of one or two families. The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique have distributed nationalized land to the teams for long-term lease and cultivation for private profit.

To support what actually amounts to private ownership of agricultural land, the Soviet revisionist renegades have lifted all restrictions on the prices of agricultural produce and livestock products in the free markets. Capitalist free markets have been created on a large scale and free competition now operates to the satisfaction of big private merchants. Large free markets with modern facilities have been constructed at huge costs. Industrial products and even means of production are peddled in these free markets. Agricultural and industrial commodities not available in the "state stores" could be bought at the free markets at high prices. Commodities produced by underground factories are also sold here. The "state stores" have also turned to profit-seeking and free competition. A state of confusion reigns in the entire commercial sector at the expense of the people.

To build "communism", the Soviet revisionist renegades have turned to seeking aid from foreign monopoly groups. Brezhnev has turned into reality Khrushchov's wish "to accept credits from the devil himself". It has gotten loans from monopoly capitalist groups in the United States, France, Italy and Japan. It has gotten loans from West Germany by bartering away the sovereign interests of the German Democratic Republic. It has sold out Soviet natural resources to and invited Japan into Siberia. It is shockingly shameless for a country that claims to be "socialist" to beg for loans from entities defeated during World War II. According to Pomeroy himself, the Soviet Union puts "considerable emphasis" on the importation of consumer goods from the imperialist countries despite its claims to superabundance.

On the basis of the all-round restoration of capitalism, the Soviet Union has become social-imperialist, exploiting and reducing a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic into its colonies. These colonies have been turned by Soviet social-imperialism into orchards, subsidiary processing shops, sources of raw materials, fields of investment, dumping ground for Soviet industrial products. Brezhnev has aggravated Khrushchov's policy of "international division of labor" which dictates on the members of the Comecon to serve the needs of Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism.

The claws of Soviet social-imperialism have also extended far into other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It pretends to extend long-term loans at a nominal interest rate of 2 1/2 per cent. But in fact it delivers shoddy goods that are overpriced. Soviet social-imperialism is also a big munitions merchant, which arbitrarily prices and extracts huge profits from the sale of arms and ammunition to various countries. To India and the United Arab Republic, it delivers weapons of better quality than those it delivered to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam simply because these countries pay hard currency or pay in kind with local commodities that are greatly underpriced.

In line with its social-imperialist and social-fascist character, the Soviet Union has steadily employed ^{social} militarism. Its economic activity is more and more geared to arms expansion and war preparations. It would rather produce

guns than butter. There is increasing talk of "centralism" in the management of the economy, but only on account of the militarist and aggressive schemes of the big monopoly bureaucrats who have forced on the Soviet people the burden of social-imperialism.

The economic situation in the Soviet Union was bad enough in 1967, when Pomeroy wrote his book. But it has become even worse in succeeding years as a result of the "new economic system" or "economic reform" pushed by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique. Under the leadership of Stalin, Soviet industry used to develop at a high speed. Taking for example the 1950-53 period, the average annual rate of growth of Soviet industry stood at 16 per cent. But this dropped to 9.6 per cent during the nine years following the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 under Khrushchov. This further dropped to 8.5 per cent during the five years since Brezhnev assumed power in 1965. Despite the boastful claims of Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters about the "higher level of techniques" today, the growth rates of labor productivity have consistently gone down in the Soviet Union.

The shortage of industrial products has become more and more acute because of the disproportionate development of production in various branches. The Soviet revisionist renegades admit that the variety of steel products in 1970 could meet only half of the actual needs and that many departments in need of steel products could not get them. Great difficulties also attended the supply of fuel for public utilities and domestic use. Nearly all the union republics suffered from a shortage of building materials and parts. Work came to a standstill in many factories for lack of raw materials.

Brezhnev has done worse than Khrushchov in the field of agriculture. Based on the doctored statistics officially released by the revisionist renegades themselves, the per capita grain output in the Soviet Union in the 1965-69 period was 16 kilograms less than in 1964, the year of Khrushchov's downfall; the per capita cotton output--the main economic crops--stagnated in 1969; the per capita output of potatoes, vegetables, etc. fell noticeably. The situation in animal husbandry was even worse. The per capita head of oxen, pigs and sheep went down sharply at the end of 1969 as compared with that at the end of 1915. Sorely lacking in a supply of vegetables and beef, Brezhnev, just like Khrushchov, certainly cannot make even a "goulash" semblance of communism.

The 1966-70 "five-year economic plan" of the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has fallen far below its already low targets. Instead of raising the living standards of the people, it has merely raised their costs of living. Basic commodities, including bread, salt and matchsticks, are in short supply, have poor quality and are highly-priced in the Soviet Union. It is absolutely foolish for Pomeroy to imagine "superabundance" or hope for it with the use of capitalist methods under his Soviet revisionist masters. The Soviet working people are suffering heavily; and the roots of their suffering is the all-round restoration of capitalism by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades.

On the Question of the Superstructure

Chairman Mao Tsetung is the Lenin of the present era. He has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and comprehensively, and has brought it to a higher and completely new stage, Mao Tsetung Thought. To him we owe the invincible ideological weapon that makes certain the total collapse of imperialism and the world-wide victory of socialism.

Upon the rise of modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialists and their running dogs were gleeful and jumped to the conclusion that a dictatorship of the proletariat can be eroded by time. But Chairman Mao has come forward and brought forth the key to the solution of the problem of the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society after analyzing and summing up the historical experience of socialist countries. He has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has successfully put it into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolutionary mass movement under the leadership of the proletariat for seizing the superstructure and making it conform to the socialist economic base. It has resulted in the

overthrow of Party persons taking the capitalist road, consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and tempered the People's Republic of China to become the strongest bulwark of socialism in the world. In the process of this unprecedented epoch-making revolution, successors of the revolution have come forward to frustrate the hopes of the imperialists and the social-imperialists for a restoration of capitalism in China.

For all these, the Soviet revisionist renegades and their hack Pomeroy hate Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for. They have a grim fright for their own inevitable doom in the hands of the revolutionary masses. They would utter anything as they try to seek comfort from their own shadows. Thus, Pomeroy describes the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as "based on an effort to build socialism and communism on 'a very low level'". They describe modern revisionism, the restoration of capitalism and putting material incentives in command of everything as being "on a higher level".

Pomeroy further tries to misrepresent the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution:

The occurrence, during the proletarian cultural revolution, of indiscriminately rejecting and even destroying the literature, art and other cultural forms of the past, caused one of the most disturbed reactions among the Soviet people I met, who ascribed the behavior to extreme nationalism. It was generally asserted to me that the Red Guards, who carried this out had seriously damaged the image of socialism and of communist behavior in the eyes of the world.

The main current of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was excellent. The ghosts and monsters were swept away from positions of dominance in the superstructure. But there was no "indiscriminate rejection and destruction" of the literature, art and cultural forms of the past. Traditional and foreign forms that can serve the present revolutionary needs of China and the proletariat were used and given correct revolutionary content, as splendidly evident in the literary and art models that emerged in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Even those things of the past that are definitely not proletarian in character were preserved in their isolated places to serve as negative examples. With regard to the Red Guards, they constitute a great mass movement that has heightened the revolutionary spirit of serving the people among the youth, that has tempered the youth in revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the proletariat and that has trained hundreds of millions of youth as successors in the revolution. The imperialists and social-imperialists have been most disappointed with the Red Guards because their emergence has served to explode the sinister hope that modern revisionism would take over China as it has in the Soviet Union upon the coming of the "third or fourth generation".

As fools who never discard their worn-out tricks, the Soviet revisionist renegades wish through Pomeroy to discredit Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for in the same manner that they have tried to discredit the great Marxist-Leninist Comrade Stalin. They harp on what they call the "personality cult" and "the harmful effects of Stalinism".

The revisionist renegades are as absurd as "mayflies plotting to topple a giant tree" as they try to picture the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as a mere expression of "nationalist outlook". This theory encompasses the new democratic revolution and socialist revolution and guarantees the transition of socialism to communism. In taking the great contributions of Chairman Mao to the stage of Leninism alone, no genuine revolutionary would ever fail to give him due respect as a great leader of the world proletariat.

Much as he would want to present in his book a culture "on a higher level" in the present system dominated by the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalists, Pomeroy merely succeeds in presenting a degenerate bourgeois culture whose best claims in Pomeroy's own terms are to "liberalism", "Western influence" and even to "mysticism". He misrepresents this as the fruit of a "50-year cultural revolution". Thus, he slanders the October Revolution even as he pretends to commemorate it with his book.

He is extremely happy to observe that "the trend to liberalism has been set" and hails the Pravda editorial (January 27, 1967) "indicating that the forces for liberalization were gradually prevailing". Swaggering with his bourgeois ideology, he raves: "An emotional, or romantic, acceptance of Marxism . . . had contributed to the blindness that had enabled the phenomenon of Stalinism to go uncorrected for so long." Here it is clear that the "anti-Stalinism" of the Soviet revisionist renegades is actually a pretext for their anti-Marxism and anti-Leninism.

These anti-communist scoundrels always pretend to honor Lenin and to invoke his name. But as Lenin once said:

It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes.

In essence, the revisionist renegades use the name of Lenin to attack Lenin and refer to Leninism only to attack Leninism.

Pomeroy refers to such bourgeois degenerates as Boris Pasternak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Anatoly Zhigulin, Bulat Okujava, Andrei Voznesensky and the like as the cream of Soviet literature in what he calls a "50-year cultural revolution". He considers as their principal qualification their being "anti-Stalinist". And he trumpets at the same time the theory of literature for literature's sake. He raves: "He who is ready to criticize must also be ready for the give and take of the process, although it should be expected that criticism of literature be kept within the literary framework." "Criticism of literature within the literary framework" denies the political character of every literary work. Chairman Mao teaches us:

In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is no such thing as art for art's sake, art that stands above classes, art that is detached from or independent of politics. Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, cogs and wheels in the whole revolutionary machine.

Pomeroy pays the highest tribute to Andrei Voznesensky whom he touts as "the best poet to emerge from the current literary ferment". He reports that they agreed in their talk that the 20th Congress "had contributed to a great release of expression." The revisionist scoundrel Pomeroy at the same time endorses what Voznesensky calls a "resurgence of the age-old mysticism in the Russian soul that is found in much of our literature".

He is glad that the Sinyavsky-Daniel case has become a rallying point within the Soviet Writers' Union for further "liberalization". He considers as "conservative" the lip-service given by Brezhnev to the "principle of partisanship in art and literature and the class approach in assessing all matters in the cultural sphere."

Twisting Lenin's statement that "Marxism is an example of how communism arose out of the sum total of human knowledge", Pomeroy seeks to equate it with Brezhnev's statement that "the tasks of the Komsomol is to help the younger generation . . . to enrich their memory with the knowledge of all the values created by mankind." And in this regard, he praises the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth for having "the broadest interest in Western literature" which is "never a contradiction to what the young people loved in their own". In whom are they interested most? Hemingway, Salinger, John Updike, Kafka, Beckett and Ionesco! Pomeroy tries to pass off bourgeois cosmopolitanism for proletarian internationalism.

He is happy to report that Shelley and Byron are being quoted and interpreted "solely in the light of being defenders of the British working class" in Soviet secondary schools. He approves of Hemingway as the favorite author of the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth and lauds this bourgeois defeatist author for "the courage of his heroes, his preoccupation with good and noble impulses in people" and "the moral tone of his distinctions". He also approves of John Steinbeck as another "favorite author". He praises John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath and Winter of Our Discontent for "preaching protest against violence". A true Marxist-Leninist could easily see the essence of Steinbeck as a bourgeois literary pessimist, at most interested in exposure but terrified by revolutionary violence. There is no surprise at all that this anti-communist scoundrel today rabidly supports the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam.

By way of countering any argument that Soviet revisionist intellectuals are too much engrossed in Western bourgeois literature, Pomeroy makes a defense that merely exposes further the counter-revolutionary character of his Soviet revisionist colleagues as well as his own. He states:

A fierce respect for the great figures of Russian literature and art is to be found among the Soviet intellectuals, and this is in a sense one of the best defenses against Western subversion. Pushkin, Tolstoy, Gogol, Chekhov, even Dostoevski, are turned to for cultural sustenance.

Pomeroy completely neglects to pay even lip-service to the great proletarian revolutionary writer, Maxim Gorky. It is condemnable that he and his fellow revisionist renegades can turn for succor and sustenance only to bourgeois-feudal masters of art and literature. These anti-Marxists and anti-Leninists find nothing noteworthy or praiseworthy about the cultural achievements of the Soviet proletariat. They can only appreciate those things in the superstructure that denigrate the dictatorship of the proletariat and that support the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Thus, such bourgeois degenerates as Ilya Ehrenburg and Mikhail Sholokhov have officially become literary favorites of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades as well as of U.S. imperialism.

Though at certain points he seems to deny that the Soviet revisionist renegades are already under the sway of Western bourgeois culture, Pomeroy cannot avoid citing even the grossest manifestations of such sway, like the blackmarketing youth who asks him if he has foreign goods to sell or the youth who shows interest in dope. He is glad that what he regards as the cream of the Soviet youth, in fancy Western-style get-up, twist to the tune of American jazz in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. He raves: "The best Soviet jazz orchestras, like the Jazz '64 and the Jazz '65 groups, are superb musicians who have distilled the very best in Western jazz and are applying it to Russian folk strains." He states:

Young people see their interest in such cultural aspects as being in line with their internationalism, and not as an anti-Soviet attitude. They feel that any restrictions on such interests are a departure from the internationalism their organizations advocate.

Modern revisionism has arisen in the Soviet Union as a result of the failure to seize the superstructure from the bourgeoisie and also as a result of vigorous attempts of imperialism to push in its ideological influence. Because culture is the concentrated expression or reflection of politics and economics, Soviet culture--as Pomeroy himself reports--is a testimony to the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It is clear that before this all-round restoration of capitalism the counter-revolutionaries bred their ranks within the superstructure. They did not immediately seize political power by force of arms or openly convert the socialized means of production into private ones. What they did was to sneak into the Party, the government, the army and various spheres of culture and gradually turn these into their instruments. Concentrating on ideological work, they worked from within until conditions were ripe. In this regard, Chairman Mao teaches us:

To overthrow a political power, it is always necessary first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter-revolutionary class.

Regarding the question of struggle in the superstructure in a socialist society, Chairman Mao has pointed out:

We have won basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, but we have not yet won complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has not been really settled yet. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked.

It will take a fairly long period of time to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism. The reason is that the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who come from the old society will remain in our country for a long time to come, and so will their class ideology. If this is not sufficiently understood, or is not understood at all, the gravest mistakes will be made and the necessity of waging the struggle in the ideological field will be ignored.

On Peaceful Coexistence and Social-Imperialism

From Khrushchov to Brezhnev, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has reflected the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. Though the Soviet revisionist rulers pay lip-service to proletarian internationalism, they actually betray the interests of the world proletariat and all oppressed peoples for the benefit of the international bourgeoisie, particularly of the Soviet monopoly bourgeoisie. ^{Since} ~~During~~ the sixties, a full-blown Soviet social-imperialism ^{has} joined U.S. imperialism to become one of the two main enemies of the world proletarian revolution. It became the principal accomplice of U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution and several times it tried to outdo U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution.

The anti-Stalin campaign launched by Khrushchov formally marked the inception of a bourgeois foreign policy by the Soviet Union. In itself the campaign had the motive and effect of causing a serious disruption and split within the international communist movement. Under the banner of anti-Stalinism, the modern revisionists and Right opportunists crept out of their holes in all Communist Parties and in socialist states and acted to seize control over these, succeeding in so many cases. Refusing to be taken in by the anti-communist stand taken by Khrushchov, the Chinese Communist Party, the Albanian Party of Labour and other Marxist-Leninist parties stood their ground.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU put forward the line of "peaceful coexistence" and the "parliamentary road". The Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution was impugned. It was loudly proclaimed by the Soviet betrayers of Lenin and Stalin that the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism was already changing and becoming tractable and that Communist Parties in countries dominated by reactionary regimes could get to power through elections and the parliamentary road. The historical experience and lessons of the world proletariat were covered up by the modern revisionists. The Communist Party of the Philippines for one was taken in by the revisionist line through the instrumentality of the Lava revisionist renegades who promptly heeded the call for betrayal made by Khrushchov.

Khrushchov and his fellow revisionist renegades, including Brezhnev and Kosygin, knew no bounds in their betrayal of Leninism. They raised "peaceful coexistence" to the level of a general line and elaborated it into the three "peacefuls" and the two "wholes". They touted their agreements with U.S. imperialism to monopolize nuclear weapons as the key to world peace. Even as they sang duets about "peace", the Soviet Union and the United States engaged in arms expansion and war preparations against the people and acted as superpowers colluding and contending with each other as their respective self-interests dictated, at the expense of the peoples of the world.

Pomeroy misrepresents as "putting nationalist interests ahead of the struggle for peace and for the unity of all revolutionary forces against imperialism" China's resistance to the sanctification of the nuclear monopoly by the superpowers and to the imperialist privilege of nuclear blackmail. After all the "disarmament" treaties (such as the nuclear test ban treaty and the non-proliferation treaty) signed by the Soviet Union with the United States, how far have these gone toward complete nuclear disarmament? Not an inch.

Absolutely contradicting the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet revisionist renegades gave way on matters of principle to the U.S. imperialists. A short while before his visit to Eisenhower in 1961, Khrushchov arbitrarily tore to pieces the ~~Chinese~~ ^{Sino}-Soviet agreement on nuclear cooperation and took sides with the Indian reactionaries who were belligerently encroaching upon Chinese territory. While in the United States, he made buffonish counter-revolutionary statements like "even capitalists can join the communist movement" and "communism is beef plus goulash". After this U.S. visit, he went to China and asked the Chinese leadership to accept the "Two China" policy and to release U.S. agents and spies who had been arrested in China.

China rebuffed all these ridiculous demands of Khrushchov even as he resorted to economic blackmail. After completely failing to get what he wanted, he eventually tried to sabotage the Great Leap Forward and take advantage of the imperialist blockade and natural calamities that had created difficulties in China. He ordered the

sudden withdrawal of Soviet "aid". But Pomeroy wishes to ^{depict} ~~misrepresent~~ this as "gradual withdrawal" resulting from "differences over the observance of economic laws". He prates: "Differences over the observance of economic laws appear to have been the cause of the general withdrawal from China of Soviet technicians whose recommendations were ignored or overruled."

The real cause was that Khrushchov was maddened by China's refusal to follow the dictates of his great-power chauvinism, his capitulation to U.S. imperialism and his scheme to turn China into an economic appendage of the Soviet Union. After the withdrawal of Soviet "aid", it was discovered to the great relief of the Chinese people that Soviet goods and technical services were extremely overpriced and payments in the form of Chinese products were in effect underpriced. It was also discovered that the Soviet Union had relabelled and resold West German goods to China at great profit.

It is utterly ridiculous, therefore, for Pomeroy to rave that:

... the Chinese people would have had no need to carry out economic construction by depriving themselves of the prime necessities, as was earlier the case of the Soviet people, if the leaders of China conducted a policy of all-round cooperation within the framework of the socialist community.

Despite all attempts at sabotage of the Soviet revisionist renegades and their Chinese agents like Liu Shao-chi, the Great Leap Forward triumphed in the end and proved correct Chairman Mao's line of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts."

What "socialist community" is Pomeroy talking about? The Soviet Union imposes fetter upon fetter on its so-called fraternal countries. Under the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, it uses its overlord position to force these countries to have their national economies serve as the markets, subsidiary workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches for the making of superprofits by the Soviet revisionist renegades. Under the Warsaw Treaty Organization, it employs the most brutal methods to keep these countries under control and stations massive numbers of troops there. The "socialist community" is nothing but the colonial empire of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has pursued basically Khrushchov's foreign policy and carried it to the extreme through the most brazen acts of aggression against its colonial dependencies as well as against the People's Republic of China. It has invaded Czechoslovakia with hundreds of thousands of foreign troops under its command and put up a puppet government at bayonet point. It has stationed several Soviet divisions in the Mongolian People's Republic and has moved millions of troops to the Chinese-Soviet borders. It has repeatedly made nuclear threats against China and has encroached upon Chinese territory such as Chenpao island and the Tieliekti area. It is overstretching itself on a scale even larger than what the old tsars aspired for.

Khrushchov's foreign policy has been aggravated and carried to the extreme by the Brezhnev revisionist renegades. It is under the exponents and practitioners of Khrushchovism without Khrushchov that Soviet modern revisionism has emerged full-blown as social-imperialism. Lenin defined this social-imperialism as "socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism."

Once the political power of the proletariat is usurped by a revisionist clique, a socialist state either turns into social-imperialism, as in the case of the Soviet Union, or is reduced into a dependency or colony, as in the case of Czechoslovakia and the Mongolian People's Republic. In having state power in their hands, the modern revisionists of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev type are far more dangerous and vicious than the classical revisionists of the Kautsky-Bernstein type. These sham anti-imperialists but real imperialists of today can resort to various kinds of bullying and deceptive tricks against the people.

Under the banner of social-imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegades have laid out a number of fascist "theories" to make ~~what they call~~ the Brezhnev Doctrine.

First, there is the theory of "limited sovereignty". It means that the Soviet Union holds the "supreme sovereignty" which is "unlimited" while the sovereignty of other countries is "limited". The so-called interests of socialism that are to be safeguarded are nothing but the interests of Soviet social-imperialism.

Second, the theory of "international dictatorship". It means that the Soviet Union can engage in military intervention in or military occupation of a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic. The Warsaw Pact is nothing but a bludgeon of Soviet social-imperialism; the signboard of "aid to a fraternal country" is raised merely to ensure a puppet government as in Czechoslovakia.

Third, the theory of "socialist community". It means that the Soviet Union is the metropolitan state of the colonial empire and the lesser revisionist countries are the colonies. The latter are supposed to be "inseparable" from the former.

Fourth, the theory of "international division of labor". It means that a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic as well as all countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America should provide "traditional export commodities" to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is supposed to broaden its colonial spheres of influence in order to get raw materials from backward countries at great profit for itself.

Fifth, the theory that "our interests are involved". It means that since the Soviet Union is a "superpower", it is entitled to meddle in the affairs of every other country, no matter how territorially far it is. The Soviet social-imperialists have repeatedly embarked on "gunboat diplomacy" under this theory.

In its relations with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Soviet social-imperialism has always sought to exercise political control and extort superprofits through its "aid". It pretends to extend loans at low interest rates but overprices the goods and technical services that it gives. Payment for these is made mainly in the form of raw materials which are in effect greatly underpriced. The Soviet Union also acts as a munitions merchant and sets an arbitrary price for the military material that it delivers. It is very instructive to study closely how the Soviet Union has taken advantage of India, Egypt and other countries.

Completely opposing the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union has extended more military aid to India than the United States has done. It also continues its economic and military "aid" for the Indonesian fascists who have butchered at least one million of the Indonesian people, including hundreds of thousands of Communists. Because it has more interest than the United States in the opening of the Suez Canal, it strikes bargains with U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism and ceaselessly maneuvers for a "political settlement" behind the backs of the Palestinian and Arab people.

Pomeroy tries to create a picture of all-out support by the Soviet revisionist renegades for the Vietnamese people's revolutionary struggle for national liberation and national salvation against U.S. imperialism. He conveniently forgets to cite the fact that Khrushchov never wanted to support the Vietnamese revolutionary struggle. What Pomeroy wants to impress on others is that the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique is now giving billions of roubles worth of "aid". It needs to be pointed out that the Soviet revisionist renegades have always had the bad habit of drawing up bloated and falsified figures to deceive the Soviet people concerning "aid" to Vietnam.

The Soviet revisionist policy towards the Vietnamese people is one of sham support and real betrayal. In fact, the Soviet Union has given more "aid", including more powerful military equipment to certain governments. The real pur-

pose of Soviet "aid" to the Vietnamese people is only to be able to make use of the Vietnam War as a leverage for cheap bargains with U.S. imperialism and as a medium for introducing intrigues among revolutionary forces. At one point, the Soviet Union even had the temerity to demand that China allow it to open air corridors and military bases in China's aerial and land space under the pretext of transporting its own "aid" for the Vietnamese people. Of course, China rebuffed this demand. Soviet "aid" to Vietnam passes through China unimpeded.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegades have repeatedly raised the slogan of "united action" and "united anti-imperialist struggle" on the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam. But their aim is merely to shake off their isolation arising from their counter-revolutionary actions and hit back at the revolutionary forces that are isolating them. If their aim were really to support the Vietnamese people, they can always make use of bilateral agreements. But their aim is to make trouble among the revolutionary forces and to put into question the undeniable fact that China is the closest, strongest and most reliable rear not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese people. As the U.S. war of aggression has expanded throughout Indochina, China has emerged as the most powerful supporter of the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian people; and the Soviet Union as the shammiest supporter, always angling for an opportunity to strike a bargain with U.S. imperialism.

There is both collusion and contention in the relationship between Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism. These are two "superpowers" agreed on opposing revolution, the people, China and communism. At the same time, it is in their imperialist nature to struggle for a redivision of the world. Each has its own hegemoniac schemes. The only difference between them is that one covers up its imperialist nature by spouting slogans of anti-imperialism, as sufficiently manifested by Pomeroy's own posturings.

Conclusion

It is an important and necessary task to study thoroughly Soviet social-imperialism and every attempt of the local revisionist renegades to promote modern revisionism in the Philippines. Therefore, William J. Pomeroy's Half a Century of Socialism cannot pass unnoticed. Our study should sharpen our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and revolutionary politics, improve our current work and style in fighting for people's democracy and provide us with a clear view of the future--socialism.

Chairman Mao has provided us with the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has shown us in practice how to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. An antidote to opportunism at its worst and to social-imperialism has been found. That is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, the revolutionary theory of the proletariat in the present era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world-wide victory.

Within the Soviet Union, the revisionist renegades will eventually be doomed. Chairman Mao has pointed-out:

The Soviet Union was the first socialist state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was created by Lenin. Although the leadership of the Soviet party and state has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long.

Chairman Mao has also pointed out:

Working hand in glove, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism has begun.

The counter-revolutionary collusion between U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism against the people, communism and China has its own limits. In the deepening crisis of world imperialism, the struggle among imperialist powers for redividing the world will intensify and hasten their own doom. Like U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism is over-extending itself. As it overstretches, its crisis at home will inevitably worsen. It is now sitting on a volcano. The Soviet proletariat and people of various nationalities will in due time rise to overthrow the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie and its whole retinue of revisionist renegades.

In short, social-imperialism is nothing but a passing phase in the downward course of imperialism.

Chairman Mao has urged us:

People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in which atom bombs are used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionary war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!

* * *

Additions and Corrections

POMEROY'S APOLOGIA FOR SOVIET REVISIONISM

Page 1

9th line of first paragraph should read: "and his revisionist gang have outdone Khrushchev in bringing about the aid- . . ."

Page 2

Second sentence of last paragraph should read: "These recent theoretical and practical contributions of Chairman Mao, signalled by his famous work On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, have brought the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism to a completely new and higher stage."

Page 3

Sentence beginning on the 3th line of 2nd paragraph should read: "There are vestigial, latent and hidden agents of the big bourgeoisie who . . ."

9th line of 4th paragraph should read: "operate the means of production as capitalist enterprises and poison education . . ."

Page 4

Enclose in quotation marks the word "internationalism" on last line of page.

Page 6

Line before last line of second paragraph should read: "over scarce goods at department stores in such show-window cities as Moscow and . . ."

Page 7

5th to 7th line of 6th paragraph should read: "Khrushchev is hereby blamed for not expanding the private plots fast enough and for not developing the private economy in agriculture fast enough. In this regard, Pomero reports: . . ." Add "proletarian" before "founders" on first line of 7th paragraph.

Page 10

7th line of 5th paragraph should read: "Republic, it delivers weapons of better quality than those it has delivered to the . . ."

2nd line of last paragraph should read: "Soviet Union has steadily engaged in social-militarism. Its economic activity is more and . . ."

Page 11

The word "situations" on first line of first complete paragraph should read: "situation".

Add the word "of" before "today" on 11th line of first complete paragraph.

The word "crops" on 5th line of 3rd complete paragraph should read: "crop".

6th line of 3rd complete paragraph should read: "output of potatoes, vegetables, etc. seriously fell. The situation . . ."

Last sentence of third complete paragraph should read: "Without enough supply of vegetables and beef, Brezhnev certainly cannot make 'goulash' communism as Khrushchev before him was not able to."

First sentence of 4th paragraph should read: "The 1966-70 'five year economic plan' of the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique fell far below its already low targets."

Page 12

First line of page should read: "overthrow of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road, consolidated the dictatorship . . ."

(over)

Page 14

Add "and praises" after the word "reports" on 5th line of 3rd paragraph.

Page 15

Second line of first paragraph should read: "reflected the all-round restoration of capitalism. Though the Soviet . . ."

Change the word "During" with "Since" and add "has" before "joined" on 6th line of first paragraph.

Last sentence of first paragraph should read: "It has become the principal accomplice of U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution and has always tried to outdo U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution."

Enclose in quotation marks the phrases "nuclear test ban treaty" and "non-proliferation treaty" on 5th and 6th lines of 5th paragraph.

Page 16

First line on page should read: "sudden withdrawal of Soviet 'aid'." But Pomeroy now wishes to depict this as . . ."

7th line of 2nd complete paragraph should read: "Despite all attempts at sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades and their . . ."

Change the word "Chinese-Soviet" with "Sino-Soviet" on 7th line of 4th complete paragraph.

Page 17

First paragraph should read: "Under the banner of social-imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegades have laid out a number of fascist 'theories' to make the 'Brezhnev Doctrine'."